Dear Harry, 12/12/81

Until the first of my recent operations I used to handle each day's mail as it came. I'd read a letter and then respond. For more than a year I have been much more limited in what I can do and in the time I have. But I do read letters as soon as I get them so that I can know what they hold and whether they require anything immediate. If they do, I do respond promptly.

I have a stack on my desk that depresses me. But when your last letter came and read it I responded as soon thereaftee as it was convenient. By then I did not have as clear a recollection of its details. I had an incorrect recollection of the 2.5 cm reference. I misunderstood it to be the point the panel placed the wound above where Fink had placed it to the Commission.

There has never been any doubt in my mind that jackie actually went for a piece of skull. But that is not what you said. You said that she had retrieved it and tried to put it back in place. The difference is pretty great.

With regard to the AP man: I had to disassociate myself from some of the things you said. I cautioned you in advance about this. Some, like the Rather crack, are pretty far out and material to nothing, really. It is a tendency you would, I think, do well to try to curb.

On the autopsy sketch: my recollection is not now clear but Fink testified, perhaps in N.O., that one was his. I think of the skull and I think his Commission testimony was so vague that I originally believed it was a teaching sketch he had made earlier for some of his teaching. I believe that the body chart was boswell's. Compare the handwriting.

After the passing of time it often is difficult to find a current news peg on which to hang a story. Maybe you'll get a new statement from a new witness that will serve. The problem is an old one.

I can't begin to think of managing. I can't find time for my own long-overdue work. I've also made it a practise not to read any of the manuscripts in advance. Despite my closeness to Roffman I declined.

The indices I have do not include the new Meagher one because I could put that money to better use, little as I have. I have only one copy of her first one. Those kinds of things are now in my literary past. I cannot return to them so do not now have such needs. As you can see, my recollections are no longer as vivid or dependable simply because those things no longer are in my mind.

Isolation also is not new. You'll just have to learn to live with it and what will be more difficult for you, to ignore so much that is wrong or evil about which nothing can be done. Instead of wasting your time and turning others off with denunciations. You did that with Chris re the Globe and Sun. They were of no interest to him and there was no possibility of his referring to either in his piece.

Chins up - and good luck!